APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/429,522	10/28/1999	PETER C. BAHRS	AUS990339US3	6039

7590   05/12/2003

DUKE W YEE
CARSTEN YEE & CAHOON LLP
P O BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 February 2000* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *64-82* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *64-82* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *3* .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other:　.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the application, preliminary amendments filed on 10/28/1999,

and 2/15/2002 respectively.

This action is made Non-final.

2.   In the preliminary amendment, claims 1-63, and 83-380 have been canceled. Claims 64-

82 are pending in the case. Claims 64, 66, 69, 77, 79, and 82 are independent claims.

Drawings

3.   The drawings filed on 3/27/2000 have been approved by the draftsperson.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 66-68 recite the limitation "the plurality of containers", and "the contain in the

graphical user interface" in lines 5-6, 7-8 respectively, of claim 66. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It appears that "the contain" is referring to the

container, and "the plurality of containers" refers to "a container".

6.   Claim 74 recites the limitation "a plurality of the first objects" in lines 2-3. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It appears that "a plurality of the

first objects" refers to "the first object".

7.   Claims 79-81 recite the limitation "the plurality of containers", and "the contain in the graphical user interface" in lines 6, 7-8 respectively, of claim 79. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It appears that "the contain" is referring to the container, and "the plurality of containers" refers to "a container".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 64, 66-71, 73-74, 76-77, and 79-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poff et al, hereinafter Poff (Pat. # 6,330,659, 12/11/2001, filed on 11/6/1997).

        Regarding independent claim 64, Poff discloses a system for creating, and displaying containers, such as windows, frames, panels, menu bars, etc, in computer display using a Java rendering engine—*first object* (c.4,L.42-c.5,L.27, c.16,L.6-67, fig.7, 11).

        Moreover, Poff discloses the drawing, and controlling the placement of containers, such as windows in the computer display using a windows manager—*second object*—in response to the receipt of user inputs (c.12,L.18-67, c.14,L.10-c.15,L.67, c.19,L.1-8, fig.7, 11).

        Furthermore, Poff discloses an interface for generating selection input events to the Java windows manager for the drawing, and placement of containers, such as windows in the computer display using a windows manager (c.12,L.10-67, fig.7, 11). Poff fails to explicitly

disclose: *a third object*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to have provided such object, because this would have made

possible the transferring of events from the computer system to the Java windows manager.

Regarding independent claim 66, Poff discloses a system for creating, and displaying

containers, such as windows, frames, buttons, panels, menu bars, etc, in computer display using a

Java rendering engine—*view controller object* (c.4,L.42-c.5,L.27, c.16,L.6-67, fig.7, 11).

Moreover, Poff discloses the drawing, and controlling the placement of containers, such

as windows in the computer display using a windows manager—*placement object*—in response

to the receipt of user inputs (c.12,L.18-67; c.14,L.10-c.15,L.67, c.19,L.1-8, fig.7, 11).

Furthermore, Poff discloses an interface for generating input events to the Java windows

manager for the drawing, and placement of containers, such as windows in the computer display

using a windows manager (c.12,L.10-67, fig.7, 11). Poff fails to explicitly disclose: *application*

mediator object. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to have provided such object, because this would have made possible

the transferring of events from the computer system to the Java windows manager.

Regarding claim 67, which depends on claim 66, Poff discloses a system for creating, and

displaying containers, such as windows, frames, panels, menu bars, etc, in computer display

using a Java rendering engine (c.4,L.42-c.5,L.27, c.16,L.6-67, fig.7, 11).

Regarding claim 68, which depends on claim 66, Poff discloses a system for creating, and

displaying containers, such as windows, frames, buttons, panels, menu bars, etc, in computer

display using a Java rendering engine (c.4,L.42-c.5,L.27, c.16,L.6-67, fig.7, 11).

Claims 69-71, 73-74 are directed towards a display mechanism for implementing the
steps found in claim 66 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 76, which depends on claim 69, Poff discloses a system for displaying
containers, such as windows, frames, buttons, panels, menu bars, etc, in response to input to the
containers (c.12,L.20-67, c.19,L.1-34).

Claims 77, 79-81 are directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in
claims 64, and 66-68, respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 82 is directed towards a computer program product for storing the steps found in
claim 64, and therefore is similarly rejected.

10.   Claims 65, 72, 75, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Poff et al, hereinafter Poff (Pat. # 6,330,659, 12/11/2001, filed on 11/6/1997), in view of
"Mastering JavaBeans", Vanhelsuwe, L., Sybex, 1997, chapter 3.

Regarding claim 65, which depends on claim 64, Poff discloses a system for creating, and
displaying containers, such as windows, frames, buttons, panels, menu bars, etc, in computer
display using a Java rendering engine—*view controller object* (c.4,L.42-c.5,L.27, c.16,L.6-67,
fig.7, 11).

Moreover, Poff discloses the drawing, and controlling the placement of containers, such
as windows in the computer display using a windows manager—*placement object*—in response
to the receipt of user inputs (c.12,L.18-67, c.14,L.10-c.15,L.67, c.19,L.1-8, fig.7, 11). Poff fails
to explicitly disclose: *a placement listener*. However, Javabeans teaches the separation between
event sources, and entities to act on them—listeners (p.5, L.1-30). It would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided such object, because this would improve the software errors, maintenance hazards, and performance as taught by Javabeans (p.4).

Furthermore, Poff discloses an interface for generating input events to the Java windows manager for the drawing, and placement of containers, such as windows in the computer display using a windows manager (c.12,L.10-67, fig.7, 11). Poff fails to explicitly disclose: *application mediator.* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided such object, because this would have made possible the transferring of events from the computer system to the Java windows manager.

Regarding claim 72, which depends on claim 70, Poff discloses the drawing, and controlling the placement of containers, such as windows in the computer display using a windows manager in response to the receipt of user inputs (c.12,L.18-67, c.14,L.10-c.15,L.67, c.19,L.1-8, fig.7, 11). Poff fails to explicitly disclose: *—positioning object is an instance of a placement listener.* However, Javabeans teaches the separation between event sources, and entities to act on them—listeners (p.5, L.1-30). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided such object, because this would improve the software errors, maintenance hazards, and performance as taught by Javabeans (p.4).

Claim 75 is directed towards a display mechanism for implementing the steps found in claim 65, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 78 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 65, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

I.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Wong et al. (Pat. # 6,175,364), Bogdan (Pat. # 6,169,546), Diedrich (Pat. # 6,064,382),

Abdelnur et al. (Pat. # 6,208,994), Buxton et al. (Pat. # 6,469,714), Alcorn (Pat. # 6,556,218), and

Klein (Pat. # 6,185,590).

II.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at

least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

> Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

> Washington, D.C. 20231

> Or faxed to:

- **(703) 746-7238, (for After Final** communications intended for entry)

- **(703) 746-7239, (for Formal** communications intended for entry, **except formal After Final**

  communications)

Or:

- **(703) 746-7240**, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label

  "PROPOSED" or **"DRAFT"**).

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

CBP

5/2/03

Primary Examiner